DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 022 CS 503 556

AUTHOR Singleton, George; Andersen, Peter A.
TITLE The Measurement of Political Opinion Leadership.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Portland, OR, February 16-20, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Communication Research; Communication Skills; Higher Education; High Schools; *Leadership Styles; *Measurement Techniques; *Opinions; *Political Power; Secondary School Students; *Test Validity

ABSTRACT

Two studies investigated the reliability and validity of a self-report instrument designed to measure the political opinion construct. The instrument, the Measure of Political Opinion Leadership (MOPOL), was tested against six criteria: (1) overall internal reliability, (2) reliability across varied populations, (3) face validity, (4) discriminant of factorial validity, (5) convergent validity, and (6) predictive or criterion-related validity. In the first study, the 28-item instrument was administered to 245 college students, who also completed a measure of generalized political leadership. In the second study, it was administered to two samples, 475 high school students and 184 college students. The results indicated that political opinion leadership can be reliably and validly measured, even among high school students. The findings also showed that the MOPOL had face, discriminant, convergent, and predictive validity. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED2060022

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE MEASUREMENT OF POLITICAL OPINION LEADERSHIP

BY

GEORGE SINGLETON
DEPT. OF COMMUNICATION ARTS
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George Singleton

AND Peter A. Andersen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PETER A. ANDERSEN
DEPT. OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION
WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY

Paper submitted for competition in the Behavioral Science Interest Group, Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Portland Oregon, February 1980.

CS503556

THE MEASUREMENT OF POLITICAL OPINION LEADERSHIP

An important component in the flow of communication from the mass media and interpersonal sources to individuals within a society is the opinion leader. And though the amount of influence opinion leaders weild in society has been subject to debate (Harik, 1971; Troldahl & Van Dam, 1965), a general consensus exists in the literature indicating opinion leaders do perform functions of information transfer and influence (e.g., Allen, 1969; Arndt, 1968; Katz, 1957; Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955). Because of the significant role opinion leaders may play in society, considerable research has focused on opinion leadership. Several specific types of opinion leaders, however, have yet to be thoroughly studied, including the political opinion leader. One reason for this lack of research into the construct of political opinion leadership may well be the absence of a reliable and valid measure for this trait. This study, therefore attempts to correct the deficiency by developing and testing a measure of political opinion leadership.

OPINION LEADERSHIP

The general concept of opinion leadership is defined as the degree to which an individual is able to informally influence another individual's attitudes or overt behavior in a desired way with relative frequency (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971, p.35). It is this ability to influence others which makes opinion leaders important within a society. This ability to influence another often derives directly from the interpersonal relationship between the two individuals. Katz (1957) notes that in addition to serving as networks of communication,

interpersonal relationships are also sources of pressure to conform to the group's way of thinking and acting, as well as serving as sources of social support. Rogers (1962) notes that attitude change in individuals may be more effectively accomplished through interpersonal contacts (i.e.-opinion leaders) than by other means (e.g.-communication through the media). Rogers with Svenning (1969) found interpersonal channels to be most effective in changing specific technologies and procedures in several Colombian Villages, and found that opinion leaders were effective in changing or influencing the attitude(s) an individual held toward specific aspects of the modernization process (Rogers with Svenning, 1969).

Opinion leaders generally differ from non-leaders in a number of demographic and social variables. While found throughout a society's economic and social status (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, & Gaudet, 1944; Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955), opinion leaders tend to be of slightly higher social status, levels of education, and competence than followers (Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971, p.213). Opinion leaders are also more likely to engage in more social participation than non-leaders (Lionberger, 1953; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1971, p.218), and similarly expose themselves to greater amounts of mass media than opinion seekers (Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955, pp.310-312; Lionberger, 1953; Rogers & Shoemaker; 1971, p.218; Troldahl, Van Dam, & Robeck, 1965).

POLITICAL OPINION LEADERSHIP

Though there has been considerable research done in the area of opinion leadership, few studies have specifically examined the nature and characteristics of political opinion leadership. Political opinion leadership may be defined as those individuals who give political advice to, or try to convert to their own viewpoint, other individuals(Lazarsfeld, et al., 1944, p.vi). A more detailed definition is offered by Kessel (1974), who in effect labels a political opinion leader as similar to the "activist" discussed in political campaign science. Kessel's (1974) definition describes an individual with a high level of interest in politics, aware of political issues, and possessing a well-developed set of attitudes toward political candidates. A political opinion leader, then, can be defined as being a disseminator of both influence and/or information concerning political topics, and being interested in, and aware of, political events.

The actual effect political opinion leaders have in a society has been the subject of considerable study and debate among researchers. Robinson (1976) not only provides evidence for the existance of political opinion leaders in modern society, but also identifies the major effect political opinion leaders have influencing other individuals to change their attitude, opinion, or position on some subject. He utilized data gathered nationwide from 1,346 subjects after the 1968 Presidential election, and found that 32 percent of the respondents indicated they had attempted to convince others to vote for a particular candidate or policy, and 39 percent reported they had been the target of such attempts.

Harik (1971) studied how political information originally disseminated by the mass media reached the population of a small (pop. 6,000) Egyptian

city, identified the mediators of this information, and assessed the relationship between the source of the information (whether media or interpersonal) and political awareness. Political awareness was defined as an individual having heard of a particular policy. Harik (1971) found that opinion leaders in his sample were "purposeful" in their contacts with others seeking information or advice about government policies, attempting to influence the opinion seeker to take up a particular opinion toward certain government policy(ies).

As with general opinion leaders, political opinion leaders differ from opinion seekers in a number of ways. While found throughout society's occupational and social groupings (Berelson, Lazarsfeld, & McPhee, 1954 p.110) Lazarsfeld, et. al., 1944, p. vi), political opinion leaders tend to be of sightly higher social and occupational status than non-leaders (Berelson, et al., 1954, pp. 113-114; Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955, pp.294-295). Political opinion leaders are also more likely to be male (Andersen & Garrison, 1978; Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955, p.140; Richmond & McCroskey, 1975), to be more politically comptent than non-leaders (Almond & Verba, 1965, p.188), and to have higher levels of social activity than opinion seekers (Berelson, et. al; 1954, pp.110-112). Political opinion leaders also expose themselves to greater amounts of mass media than non-leaders (Andersen & Garrison, 1978; Campbell, 1966; Lazarsfeld, et al., 1944, pp. 121-122).

PREVIOUS MEASURES

Many differnt methods of measuring opinion leadership both general and political - have been used in past research. Lionberger (1953) simply asked subjects during an interview to identify who they sought as sources of farm information and they divided those identified into catagories according to how often they were chosen. Rogers with Svenning (1969) utilized four techniques to identify opinion leaders: 1) Sociometric methods, which involved asking the respondent who they would go to for information on a series of topics (e.g., farm credit, health); 2) a series of self report questions asking whether/how often the respondent gave or was asked her/his opinion on several subjects; 3) judge's rating, which involved members of the community identifying those individuals they knew, and then placing those individuals into one of ten levels of opinion leadership, and; 4) a self-anchoring ladder technique, in which the high end of a ten-step ladder represented those who were often asked for advice, and the low end represented those who were never asked for advice. The subject then indicated where on the ladder they felt they belonged. Finally, Witteman and Andersen (1976) developed a 12 item, 7 step Likert-type scale to measure polymorphic opinion leadership, and have reported consistently high internal reliability for this instrument (Witteman & Andersen, 1976; Witteman & Andersen, 1979).

As with general opinion leadership, political opinion leadership has also been measured using a variety of methods and procedures. Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet (1944) used interviews and questionnaires in their panel study over time, and employed between two and ten items/questions to gauge stuject level of political opinion leadership. Berlson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee (1954) utilized three self-report questions to measure political

opinion leadership, but only one of these truly tapped the construct. ("Have you tried to convince anyone of your political ideas recently?" p.175). Katz and Lazarsfeld (1955) used interviews, follow-up interviews, and a series of self-report items designed to discover how often individuals gave or received an opinion on a number of topics, including public affairs. Robinson (1976) used two items on tap opinion leadership related to politics. One item was concerned with opinion giving, and one item with opinion receiving (Robinson, 1976). Finally, Andersen and Garrison (1978) utilized a single ordinal scale, asking subjects the question: "How often do people ask your opinion concerning politics? (p.44)". In discussing the limitations of their study, they note that "greater precision and predictability of measurement could be obtained through the use of an interval or ratio level opinion leadership scale (p.49)".

MEASUREMENT CRITERIA

Any instrument to be used in communication research should meet certain pre-established criteria for reliability and validity. In this section specific criteria for evaluating a scale will be developed. In subsequent sections of this report the measure of political opinion leadership (MOPOL)will be tested against these criteria in an attempt to establish reliabiltiy and validity indices for the measure.

The first criterion for any measure should be its overall internal relaibility. A measure should have high internal reliabiltiy if the researcher expects to employ it in research projects. Low internal reliability will lead to type two error (failure to find significant relationships among variables) and underestimates of the size of the relationship between the instrument and other variables. Thus, the first

test of the MOPOL will be to ascertain its internal reliability.

A second criterion for a measure should be its reliability across varied populations. Since there is evidence that political attitudes and behaviors develop during adolesence (Cook & Scioli, 1972; Hess & Torney, 1976) it is important to determine if the MOPOL is reliable across age groups. If it is not reliable for the early years of adolesence the salience and validity of the insturment for those age groups would be questionable. Thus, the second test of the MOPOL will be to ascertain its internal reliability for tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade high school students as well as college students of various ages.

After establishing the reliability for an instrument (that the instrument is measuring something consistently), the next step is to establish the validity of the instrument in several ways. Therefore the third criterion for a measure should be to establish face validity. This criterion requires: 1) that the instrument measures the attitudes or behavior of interest to the investigation, and 2) whether it provides an adequate sample of those attitudes/behaviors (Selltiz, Wrightsman, & Cook, 1976). Thus the third test of the MOPOL will involve establishing its face validity.

A fourth certerion for an instrument should be its discriminant of factorial validity (Cronback, 1949; Selltiz, Wrightsman, & Cook, 1976). Items measuring a specific construct or variable should cluster or factor together, but should remain factorially distinct from items representing other constructs. Discriminant validity is established if the construct can be statistically differentiated from other constructs. Thus, the MOPOL (which measures political opinion leadership) will be factor analyzed with other items from both dissimilar and similar constructs. The dissimilar measure to be employed will be the PRCA (a measure of communication

apprehension; McCroskey, 1970). The similar measure to be used will be the POLT (a measure of generalized or polymorphic opinion leadership; Witteman and Andersen, 1976).

Factorial distinctness of the MOPOL and POLT would provide powerful evidence for the discriminant validity of both instruments, since the constructs are closely related conceptually.

The fifth criterion for an instrument is its convergent validity, or the degree to which other similar measures yield similar results (Selltiz, Wrightsman & Cook, 1976). Two similar constructs, such as generalized opinion leadership and political opinion leadership should be moderately correlated. Very high correlations between such constructs would threaten the discriminant validity discussed above. Absence of a significant correlation would indicate a lack of convergent validity. By correlating the MOPOL (a measure of political opinion leadership) with the POLT (a measure of generalized opinion leadership), this criterion can be tested.

A sixth and final criterion to be used in ascertaining and instruments worth is its predictive or criterion-related validity. This type of validity compares scores on the instrument of interest with one or more external variables believed to be associated with construct of interest (Kerlinger, 1973). To determine criterion-related validity the MOPOL was correlated with six other variables in a previous study by_____ and _____(1980).

Political opinion leadership, as measured by the MOPOL should be related to political interest. political involvement, extroversion, media exposure, communication apprehension and gender for reasons outlined by _____and _____(1980). The association of the MOPOL with these six external variables will provide a test of the sixth criterion.

METHODS

The development of the MOPOL (measure of political opinion leadership) involved two seperate studies. The following section reviews the methods employed in each of these two studies.

SUBJECT SAMPLES

In study one the 28-item MOPOL (See table 1) was administered to 245 undergraduates in several beginning and advanced-level communication class at a large Eastern University. At the same time these subjects also completed the POLT, a measure of generalized or polymorphic opinion leadership (Witteman and Andersen, 1976).

In the second study a battery of instruments were administered to two samples. The first sample consisted of 475 students attending high school in a small Eastern city, (pop., 14 626). The subjects ranged from 14 to 19 years of age with the mean just under 16 years of age. The sample included 210 males and 259 females with six subjects omitting this item. Questionnaries were administered by their teacher during regular class hours. The second sample in the second study consisted of 184 undergraduates at a large Eastern University. They ranged in age from 18 to 30 with a mean age of 21. The sample consisted of 93 males and 90 females. The questionnaire was administered by the students section instructors.

DESIGN OF THE INSTRUMENT

The goal in designing the MOPOL was to create a self-report instrument capable of validly measuring the political opinion leadership construct. The researchers generated seven types of likert items tapping seven concepts related to politics: (1) the government; (2) political advice; (3) current political events; (4) political information; (5) elections; (6) current political issues; and, (7) political opinions. For each of these concepts, four self-report items were generated, two positive and two negative. Several researchers (Andersen and Witteman, 1976; Rogers and Shoemaker, 1971) indicate that opinion leadership involves both active (the leader voluntarily provides her/his opinion) and passive (the leader is requested by others to give her/his opinion) opinion leadership. Thus, half the items were active opinion leadership items and half were

passive opinion leadership items. The final instrument consisted of a positively worded and negatively worded item for both passive and active political opinion leadership for each of the political concepts, yielding 28 5-step Likert items.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

To determine if the MOPOL met criteria 1 and 2 alpha reliability coefficients (Nunnally, 1967) were computed for the entire sample in studies one and two and for all six seperate populations; 10th graders, 11th graders, 12th graders, college freshmen, college sophmores, college juniors, and college seniors in study two. The third criterion, face validity, involved no statistical tests.

The fourth criterion, the establishment of discriminant or factorial validity was tested through the use of factor analysis. Three types of factor structures were reported. The first involved examination of the unrotated factor structure in both study one and two for evidence of the unidimensionality of the MOPOL. The second and third factor analyses employed an orthogonal rotation (varimax) and an oblique rotation (promax) and included MOPOL, POLT, and PRCA items for evidence of discriminant validity. These rotated analyses were employed in study two.

The fifth criterion, that of convergent validity, was analyzed by correlating the POLT, a measure of generalized opinion leadership, with the MOPOL, performed in study two.

The sixth and final criterion, that of predictive validity was tested via correlation coefficients and one way analysis of variance. The relationships between the MOPOL and political interest, political involvement, extroversion, media exposure and communication apprehension were tested with pearson-product-moment correlations. The relationship of biological gender to the MOPOL was tested with simple one way analysis of variance.

RESULTS

In both study one and study two, alpha coefficients were utilized to determine the internal reliability of the MOPOL, and to ascertain whether the MOPOL met criterion one. The alpha coefficient obtained in study one was .97, while the alpha coefficient in study two was calculated to be .95, (see table 2). When alpha coefficients were computed for each grade level utilized in study two, as criteria two requires, the following figures were obtained: tenth grade, .89; eleventh grade, .93; twelfth grade, .96; college freshmen, .94; college sophmore, .98; college junior, .98; and college senior, .98 (see table 2).

Criteria three involved determining whether the MOPOL possessed face validity. Face validity of the MOPOL was largely accomplished during original constuction of the items making up instrument. By using a base of seven concepts related to politics as a starting point, and creating four items (2 positive, 2 negative, 2 active, and 2 passive) for each concept, 28 items were created to comprise the MOPOL. Each of these items possesses face validity (see Table 1).

The fourth criterion consisted of three parts. First, the unrotated factor structure for the obtained in study one MOPOL clearly indicated it to be a unidimensional measure, with all loadings on the first factor in excess of .59 (see table 3). The unrotated factor structure obtained in study two for the MOPOL also indicated it to be a unidimensional measure, with no loadings on the first factor less than .44 and most above .60 (see table 4). The second and third analyses for criterion four involved submitting the MOPOL, the POLT, and the PRCA to factor analyses using both promax and varimax rotations. These two analyses were performed only in study two. The rotated analyses indicated a three-factor solution for the combined measures (see table 5 and table 6), with the MOPOL remaining a distinct factor separate from both the PRCA and, more importantly, from a measure of <u>generalized</u> opinion leadership, the POLT.

The fifth criterion involved correlating the POLT with the MOPOL, and was performed in study two. The resulting correlation coefficient was .43 ($p < .0001$).

The sixth and final criterion was concerned with the predictive validity of the MOPOL, and consisted of two parts. First, correlation coefficients (see table 7) were calculated between the MOPOL and political interest (.53), political involvement (.53), extroversion (.30), media exposure (.42), and communication apprehension (-.41). Second, a one-way analysis of variance was performed to examine the relationship between sex and political opinion leadership. This analysis indicated males ($\bar{X}$ = 78.25) to be significantly more likely than females ($\bar{X}$ = 72.48) to be political opinion leaders ($F = 12.23$, $df = 1/602$, $p.05$). The variance accounted for, however, was only two percent.

DISCUSSION

Implications Of Results

The primary implication of this study is that political opinion leadership can be reliably and validly measured. Results also indicate that sophomores in high school can precisely report their own level of opinion leadership ($r = .89$) indicating that even in the early high school years opinion leadership can be accurately measured.

Results also indicate that the MOPOL has face validity, discriminant or factorial validity, convergent validity, and predictive validity. A few more words should be said about the predictive validity of the instrument. The MOPOL was employed in a recent study by _____ and _____ (1980). They confirmed a number of hypotheses about political opinion leadership using the MOPOL. Specifically _____ and _____ (1980) hypothesized that political interest and involvement, extroversion, media exposure, and communication apprehension would be related to political opinion leadership. As reported previously, these relationships were all significant (see table 7). Moreover, males using the MOPOL, reported higher levels of political opinion leadership than females, which is consistent with many previous studies (Andersen & Garrison, 1978; Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955; Richmond & McCroskey, 1975). The ability of the MOPOL to sucessfully predict to other variables and to replicate the findings of other studies suggests the scale is ready for use as a research instrument.

Limitations Of The Study

The goal of this study was to report reliability and validity data for the MOPOL. The greatest weakness in the present study is the failure to collect data on the test-retest reliability of the instrument. While such data is presently being collected, it was not available for this report. Thus, the stability of the MOPOL over time is not presently known.

The other limitation is the nature of the sample. Data for both studies one and two were collected in only one state. The high school data was collected at only one high school in a distinctly non-metropolitan area. Future research should attempt to replicate these results in other metropolitan areas, and with nonstudent samples.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The evidence provided in this study suggests that the MOPOL can be used to reliably measure individual levels of opinion leadership. That full 28-item scale has an internal reliability of .96. Since it is frequently incovenient to use a 28-item scale a sample of items can be used without a substantial loss of reilability. Since the average inter-item correlation is .46 the reliability of various length subscales can be computed by employing Nunnally's (1967) formula 6-18. Thus, a 20 item version of the MOPOL would have an internal reliability of .95; a 10 item version would have an internal reliability of .90; and a 6 item version would have a quite acceptable internal reliability of .84. Thus, the MOPOL can be used to reliably measure opinion leadership without employing the full 28-item scale.

A second implication of these findings is the perceived opinion leadership exists and can be accurately measured in the high school. Future research should employ the MOPOL in the middle school or junior high school to ascertain the point at which adolesents or children cannot accurately report on their opinion leadership level.

Finally, since evidence indicates that both interpersonal communication and the mass media have an effect on political attitudes and behaviors (Cook & Scioli, 1972; Harik, 1971; Hess & Torney, 1967) future research should employ the MOPOL in research designed to ascertain the relative impact of opinion leaders versus the mass media.

References

Allen, I.L. Social relations and the two-step flow: a defense of the tradition. Journalism Quarterly, 1969, 46, 492-498.

Almond, G. & Verba S. The civic culture. Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., Inc., 1965.

Andersen, P.A. & Garrison, J.P. Media consumption and population characteristics of political opinion leaders. Communication Quarterly, 1978, 26, 40-50.

Arndt, J. A test of the two-step flow in diffusion of a new product. Journalism Quarterly, 1968, 45, 457-465.

Berelson, B. Lazarsfeld, P., & McPhee, W. Voting: A study of opinion formation in a presidential campaign. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Campbell, A. Elections and the political order. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Cook, T.J. & Scioli, F.P. Political socialization research in the United States: a review. In D. Nimmo and C. Bonjean (Eds.), Political attitudes and public opinion. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1972.

Cronback, L.J. Essentials of psychological testing. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Harik, I.F. Opinion leaders and the mass media in rural Eygpt: A reconsideration of the two-step flow of communications hypothesis. American Political Science Review, 1971, 65, 731-740.

Hess, R.D. & Torney, J.V. The development of political attitudes in children. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.

Katz, E. The two-step flow of communication: An up-to-date report on an hypothesis. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1957, 21, 61-78.

Katz, E., & Lazarsfeld, P.F. Personal influence: The part played by people in the flow of mass communication. New York: The Free Press, 1955.

Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Kessel, J.H. Strategy for November. In J. Barbar (Ed.), Choosing the President. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967, 95-119.

Lazarsfeld, P.H., Berelson, B., & Gaudet, H. The people's choice. New Yrok: Columbia University Press, 1944.

Lionberger, H. Some characteristics of farm operators sought as sources of farm information in a Missouri community. Rural Sociology, 953, 18, 327-328.

McCroskey, J.C. Measures of communication-bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 1970, 37, 269-277.

Nunnally, J.C. Psychometric Theory New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Richmond, V.P. & McCroskey, J.C. Whose opinion do you trust? Journal of Communication, 1975, 25, 42-50.

Robinson, J.P. Interpersonal influence in election campaigns: Two-step flow hypothesis. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1976, 40, 304-319.

Rogers, E.M. Diffusion of innovations. New York: Free Press of Glenco, 1962.

Rogers, E.M. & Shoemaker, F.F. Communication of innovations: a cross-cultural approach. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

Rogers, E.M. & Svenning, L. Modernization among peasants: The impact of communication. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, & Winston, Inc., 1969.

Selltiz, C., Wrightsman, L.S. & Cook, S.M. Research methods in social relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

_____ & _____. Adolsecent and adult political opinion leadership. Paper submitted to the International Communication Convention, Acapulco, Mexico, May, 1980.

Troldahl, V. & Van Dam, R. Face-to-face communication about major topics in the news. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1965, 29, 626-34.

Troldahl, V., Van Dam, R., & Robeck, G.B. Public affairs information-seeking from expert institutionalized sources. Journalism Quarterly, 1965, 42, 403-412.

Witteman, H.R., & Andersen, P.A. The polymorphic opinion leadership test: Development and validation. Paper presented to the Western Communication Association Convention, San Fransisco, November, 1976.

Witteman, H.R., & Andersen, P.A. A barrier to diffusion: Communication apprehension as a predictor of opinion leadership and innovativeness. Paper presented to the Western Speech Communication Association, Los Angeles, February, 1979.

Table 1
The MOPOL
(Measure of Political
Opinion Leadership)

The next group of questions are about your communication about politics and government. Continue to circle the numbers as you did above by marking whether you (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Undecided, (4) Disagree, or (5) Strongly Disagree.

		SA	A	UN	D	SD
1.	I seldom provide information about politics for my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	People often ask me my opinion about government.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I am often asked by others about current political issues.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I often provide political advice to friends.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I frequently tell people about current political events.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I rarely tell people about current political events.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I generally tell people my opinions about government.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	People rarely ask my opinion about government.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I seldom offer my opinions about elections to others.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Other people frequently ask me my opinion about elections.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I am often asked about current political events.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I seldom give my opinions about government to others.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Others rarely ask me about current political issues.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I frequently offer other people my opinion about elections.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	I often give my political opinion to others.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I seldom give my political opinion to others.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Friends often ask me for my political advice.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	My friends rarely ask me for political information.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I seldom provide my friends with political advice.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	I seldom give my opinion to others about current political issues.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Friends seldom ask me for my political advice.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Other people seldom ask my opinion about elections.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Other people rarely ask me about political events.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Others frequently ask my opinion about current political issues.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I frequently provide political information for my friends.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	Frequently, my friends ask me for political information.	1	2	3	4	5
27.	Other people often ask my opinion about politics.	1	2	3	4	5
28.	Other people seldom request my political opinions.	1	2	3	4	5

Scoring Procedure

1) Total all responses on starred items.
2) Total all responses on non-starred items.
3) MOPOL = 70 + unstarred - starred.
4) Range of scale is 28 to 140 with higher scores indicating more political opinion leadership.

Table 2
Alpha Reliability of
MOPOL Scale

	Reliability
Overall reliability for study one.	.97
Overall reliability for study two.	.95
Reliability for 10th grade.	.89
Reliability for 11th grade.	.93
Reliability for 12th grade.	.96
Reliability for college freshman.	.94
Reliability for college sophmores.	.98
Reliability for college juniors.	.98
Reliability for college seniors.	.98

Table 3

Unrotated factor analysis of the measure of Political Opinion Leadership (MOPOL) from study one.

	Factor one	Factor 2
01	-0.61	-0.25
02	0.66	0.05
03	0.78	0.06
04	0.76	0.16
05	0.76	0.07
06	-0.75	-0.10
07	0.68	0.17
08	-0.73	0.03
09	-0.59	-0.11
Q10	0.71	0.02
Q11	0.78	0.08
Q12	-0.70	-0.18
Q13	-0.78	0.02
Q14	0.75	0.12
Q15	0.80	0.15
Q16	-0.75	-0.28
Q17	0.79	0.01
Q18	-0.81	0.04
Q19	-0.69	-0.09
Q20	-0.78	-0.14
Q21	-0.75	-0.08
Q22	-0.76	-.01
Q23	-0.73	-0.14
Q24	0.75	-0.00
Q25	0.84	0.05
Q26	0.84	0.05
Q27	0.81	-0.03
Q28	0.68	-0.12

Table 4

Unrotated factor analysis of the neasure of Political Opinion Leadership (MOPOL) from study two.

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Q1	0.56	-0.20	0.06
Q2	-0.68	-0.28	-0.00
Q3	-0.70	-0.23	0.07
Q4	-0.73	-0.19	-0.02
Q5	-0.66	-0.25	-0.11
Q6	0.63	-0.02	0.02
Q7	-0.55	-0.07	-0.28
Q8	0.67	-0.10	-0.03
Q9	0.50	-0.07	0.21
Q10	-0.52	-0.16	-0.01
Q11	-0.74	-0.23	0.08
Q12	0.58	-0.25	0.21
Q13	0.60	-0.24	-0.15
Q14	-0.60	-0.17	-0.28
Q15	-0.72	-0.14	-0.22
Q16	0.67	-0.25	0.16
Q17	-0.73	-0.18	0.07
Q18	0.68	-0.14	-0.05
Q19	0.62	-0.31	0.09
Q20	0.63	-0.25	0.08
Q21	0.61	-0.39	-0.08
Q22	0.59	-0.28	-0.09
Q23	0.68	-0.22	-0.29
Q24	-0.60	-0.16	0.08
Q25	-0.68	-0.21	0.11
Q26	-0.69	-0.19	0.26
Q27	-0.66	-0.18	0.15
Q28	0.44	-0.23	-0.13

Table 5

Factor analysis with varimax rotation of the Measure of Political Opinion Leadership (MOPOL), the Polymorphic Opinion Leadership Test (POLT), and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) from study 2.

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
V1	-0.16	0.29	0.57
V2	0.04	-0.29	-0.50
V3	-0.23	0.13	0.56
V4	0.16	-0.06	-0.50
V5	0.10	-0.19	-0.61
V6	-0.13	0.24	0.39
V7	-0.10	0.30	0.51
V8	0.15	-0.20	-0.35
V9	0.02	-0.30	-0.48
V10	-0.15	0.13	0.54
V11	-0.08	0.42	0.22
V12	0.06	-0.63	-0.26
V13	-0.33	0.42	0.21
V14	0.04	-0.64	-0.15
V15	0.05	-0.61	-0.08
V16	-0.10	0.47	0.17
V17	-0.16	0.41	0.16
V18	-0.27	0.43	0.13
V19	0.29	-0.41	-0.21
V20	0.11	-0.60	-0.10
V21	-0.19	0.49	0.13
V22	0.07	-0.51	-0.22
V23	0.56	0.00	-0.14
V24	-0.64	0.17	0.11
V25	-0.66	0.20	0.10
V26	-0.72	0.14	0.07
V27	-0.63	0.12	0.07
V28	0.63	-0.01	-0.16
V29	-0.50	0.17	0.14
V30	0.64	-0.15	-0.13
V31	0.45	-0.14	-0.12
V32	-0.46	0.26	0.08
V33	-0.69	0.20	0.14
V34	0.54	-0.05	-0.23
V35	0.61	-0.05	-0.18
V36	-0.55	0.21	0.11
V37	-0.67	0.17	0.17
V38	0.63	-0.05	-0.20
V39	-0.71	0.17	0.03
V40	0.67	-0.07	-0.12
V41	0.61	-0.04	-0.18
V42	0.61	-0.06	-0.21
V43	0.62	0.01	-0.19
V44	0.57	-0.10	-0.12
V45	0.67	-0.10	-0.05
V46	-0.58	0.17	-0.00
V47	-0.67	0.20	-0.06
V48	-0.68	0.24	-0.02
V49	-0.64	0.14	0.02
V50	0.44	-0.02	-0.09

Items 1 through 10 are PRCA items.
Items 11 through 22 are POLT items.
Items 23 through 50 are MOPOL items.

Table 6

Factor analysis with promax rotation of the Measure of Political Opinion Leadership (MOPOL), the Polymorphic Opinion Leadership Test (POLT), and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) from study 2.

	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3
V1	-0.03	0.16	0.55
V2	-0.08	-0.19	-0.50
V3	-0.14	-0.01	0.57
V4	0.08	0.07	-0.52
V5	-0.01	-0.05	-0.63
V6	-0.03	0.16	0.37
V7	0.01	0.20	0.49
V8	0.08	-0.12	-0.32
V9	-0.10	-0.21	-0.47
V10	-0.06	-0.00	0.55
V11	0.01	0.41	0.14
V12	-0.08	-0.63	-0.15
V13	-0.25	0.36	0.10
V14	-0.08	-0.68	-0.02
V15	-0.06	-0.66	0.03
V16	-0.00	0.46	0.08
V17	-0.08	0.39	0.06
V18	-0.19	0.40	0.02
V19	0.21	-0.36	-0.10
V20	0.00	-0.53	0.02
V21	-0.10	0.49	0.01
V22	-0.04	-0.50	-0.13
V23	0.59	0.12	-0.08
V24	-0.64	0.06	-0.00
V25	-0.67	0.09	-0.02
V26	-0.74	0.02	-0.04
V27	-0.65	0.01	-0.02
V28	0.65	0.12	-0.08
V29	-0.49	0.07	0.05
V30	0.65	-0.03	-0.02
V31	0.45	-0.05	-0.04
V32	-0.45	0.19	-0.02
V33	-0.69	0.08	0.01
V34	0.54	0.08	-0.17
V35	0.63	0.08	-0.10
V36	-0.54	0.12	0.00
V37	-0.67	0.04	0.06
V38	0.64	0.08	-0.12
V39	-0.74	0.06	-0.09
V40	0.69	0.05	-0.02
V41	0.63	0.10	-0.11
V42	0.62	0.08	-0.13
V43	0.64	0.16	-0.13
V44	0.58	0.01	-0.04
V45	0.70	0.00	0.05
V46	-0.60	0.10	-0.13
V47	-0.70	0.13	-0.21
V48	-0.70	0.16	-0.17
V49	-0.67	0.05	-0.09
V50	0.46	0.07	-0.04

Items 1 through 10 are PRCA items.
Items 11 through 22 are POLT items.
Items 23 through 50 are MOPOL items.

Table 7

Relationship of MOPOL
with selected criterion
Variables

	Political Interest	Political Involvement	Extroversion	Media Exposure	Communication Apprehension
MOPOL	.53	.53	.30	.42	-.41
Political Interest		.50	.21	.42	-.37
Political Involvement			.24	.36	-.34
Extroversion				.19	-.53
Media Exposure					-.27
Communication Apprehension					

All correlations are statistically significant at p .0001
with n = 658.